# ROCKY FLATS ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGY SITE
# ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION
# REGULATORY CONTACT RECORD

---

**Date/Time:** May 1, 2003

**Site Contact(s):** Lane Butler, Marla Broussard, Susan Serreze
**Phone:** 303-966-5345, 303-966-6007, 303-966-2677

**Regulatory Contact:** Carl Spreng, Elizabeth Pottorff, Dave Kruchek, Harlen Ainscough
**Phone:** 303-692-3300

**Agency:** CDPHE

---

**Purpose of Contact:** Consultative Process Meeting– Meeting Notes

---

**Discussion**

**May 1, 2003, Comment Resolution Meeting**
**for**
**the Soil Risk Screen**

A meeting was held on May 1, 2003 to discuss several draft reports. However, the soil risk screen discussion took all available time.

I. Attendees

CDPHE: Harlen Ainscough, Dave Kruchek, Elizabeth Pottorff, Carl Spreng
DOE: Norma Castaneda, Rick DiSalvo, Russ McCallister, Reg Tyler
K-H: Marla Broussard, Lane Butler
K-H Team: Susan Serreze

JUL 2003
RECEIVED

II. Report Status

CDPHE was asked when comments on the Characterization Data Summary Report for IHSSs 165 and 176 would be ready. Carl Spreng stated that he would send comments soon.

III. Issues

1. The DQAs are being revised. Three examples were handed out for review.



ADMIN RECORD



1/3

C2K-166-01

2. The soil risk screen process was discussed in detail. IHSS Group 600-2 was used as an example. The example IHSS Group 600-2 soil risk screen was revised with concurrence from all parties. The revised soil risk screen language follows:

"The Soil Risk Screen (SRS) follows the steps identified in Figure 3 in Attachment 5 of the RFCA Modification (DOE et al. 2003):
**Screen 1** – Are the contaminant of concern (COC) concentrations below RFCA Table 3 WRW Soil Action Levels?
Yes, all COCs are below WRW ALs.
**Screen 4** – Is there an environmental pathway and sufficient quantity of COCs that would cause an exceedance of the surface water standard (SWS)?
Migration via erosion and groundwater are the two possible pathways whereby surface water could become contaminated by PAC 400-802. Both pathways are unlikely based on the low levels of soil contaminants and this IHSS Group being located in a flat-lying area not prone to landslides or erosion.
Groundwater monitoring results from nearby well 85202 do not indicate concentrations of analytes above RFCA groundwater Tier I ALs. Results from this well indicate that cis-1,2-dichloroethene, tetrachloroethene, vinyl chloride and trichloroethene are greater than RFCA Tier II groundwater ALs, but less than Tier I groundwater ALs as shown in the following Table:

| Analyte | Result ug/L | Tier I AL ug/L | Tier II AL ug/L |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cis-1,2-dichloroethene | 160 | 7000 | 70 |
| Tetrachloroethene | 78 | 500 | 5 |
| Vinyl chloride | 16 | 200 | 2 |
| Trichloroethene | 35 | 500 | 5 |

The nearest surface water Point of Evaluation (POE), GS50, is located approximately 3,000 feet northeast and the nearest Point of Compliance (POC), SW027, is located approximately one mile east-southeast of IHSS Group 600-2. GS50 is designed to monitor water from the Solar Evaporation Ponds and Triangle areas. Recent data from SW027, which monitors water from a large part of the IA, indicate that radionuclides are present in very small quantities at this monitoring station (total uranium .428). However the analytes in well 85202 groundwater were not reported at SW027.

Further groundwater evaluation will be part of the groundwater plume remedial decision and future sitewide evaluation.

**Screen 5** – Are COC concentrations below Table 3 Action Levels for Ecological Receptors?
Yes, all COC concentrations are below the ALs for Ecological Receptors."

It was agreed that the other closeout report soil risk screen formats would following this format and language.

3. The need for a soil risk screen for surface soil was discussed. The following language, but not a soil risk screen, was agreed to: "Contamination migration via erosion is the possible pathway whereby surface water could become contaminated by PAC 900-175. However, because PAC 900-175 is not located in an area prone to landslides or high erosion and the surface soil COCs are present in very small concentrations and are limited in their areal extent further soil removal is not necessary to protect surface water." K-H sent this language to CDPHE on May 2, 2003 for final concurrence.

It was agreed that at other IHSSs or IHSS groups where only surface soil was evaluated, the soil risk screen is not needed, but that this language along with the justification of why only surface soil was considered, will be added

IV. Meetings

The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 15, 2003, from 10:30 AM to 12:00 PM.

---

Distribution:

H. Ainscough, CDPHE
S. Gunderson, CDPHE
D. Kruchek, CDPHE
E. Pottorff, CDPHE
C. Spreng, CDPHE
T. Rehder, USEPA
G. Kleeman, USEPA
N. Castenada, RFFO
R. DiSalvo, RFFO
R. McCallister, RFFO
S. Surovchak, RFFO
R. Tyler, RFFO
L. Brooks, K-H ESS
M. Broussard, K-H RISS
L. Butler, K-H RISS
R. Davis, K-H RISS
C. Deck, K-H Legal
D. Mayo, K-H RISS
J. Mead, K-H ESS
S. Nesta, K-H RISS
L. Norland, K-H RISS
K. North, K-H ESS
A. Primrose, K-H RISS
D. Shelton, K-H
K. Wiemelt, K-H RISS
K. Griggs, K-H Team
G. Kelly, K-H Team
S. Luker, K-H Team
D. Radtke, K-H Team
D. Reeder, K-H Team
M. Ruthven, K-H Team
S. Serreze, K-H Team
T. Spence, K-H Team
E. Woodland, K-H Team
Administrative Record
ER Meeting Minutes



3/3